DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 899 95 EA 007 981

AUTHOR Coursen, David
TITLE Administrative Implications of Mainstreaming. NAESP School Leadership Digest Second Series, Number 7. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 22.
INSTITUTION National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE 33p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Integration; Court Litigation; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Handicap Detection; *Handicapped Children; Inservice Teacher Education; Labeling (of Persons); *Literature Reviews; Mentally Handicapped; *Normalization (Handicapped); *Regular Class Placement; Resource Teachers; Retarded Children; School Law; *Special Education; Testing Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Mainstreaming

ABSTRACT

"Mainstreaming" is defined as a program whereby handicapped children are placed in regular classrooms for all or part of the school day, with steps taken to see that their special needs are satisfied within this arrangement. Key court decisions are cited because the implications of mainstreaming for contemporary education can be properly understood only within the broad context of the current legal and educational status of the handicapped. The pros and cons of the special education debate are summarized, and the classification methods and effects of labeling on children are criticized. Program attributes that seem to be essential to any effective effort to mainsteam include individualized instruction, a spectrum of services and resources, and inservice teacher training to prepare teachers to educate the handicapped. (Author/HLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120899

Second Series, Number 7

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP DIGEST

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Administrative Implications of Mainstreaming

EA 007 981

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

DIGEST

Administrative Implications of Mainstreaming

David Coursen

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
National Association of
Elementary School Principals

3

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 76-12775
NAESP School Leadership Digest Second Series, Number Seven
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 007 981
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Twenty-two

Printed in the United States of America, 1976
National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Additional copies are available from NAESP for $2.50.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Association of Elementary School Principals for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Association of Elementary School Principals or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction	1
The Handicapped and the Law	3
Special Education versus Mainstreaming	6
The Problem of Labels	6
Methods of Classification	7
The Special Education Debate: Con	9
The Special Education Debate: Pro	10
The Verdict	12
The Mechanics of Mainstreaming	13
Focus on the Individual	13
A Spectrum of Services	15
The Resource Room	16
Implications for Teachers and Administrators	19
Conclusion	22
Bibliography	23

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education*. *CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $50 a year from Macmillan Information, 216R Brown Street, Riverside, New Jersey 08075. Semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

FOREWORD

Both the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management are pleased to continue the *School Leadership Digest*, with a second series of reports designed to offer school leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

The *School Leadership Digest* is a series of monthly reports on top priority issues in education. At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by NAESP.

The author of this report, David Coursen, is employed by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.

Paul L. Houts
Director of Publications
NAESP

Stuart C. Smith
Assistant Director and Editor
ERIC/CEM

INTRODUCTION

Mainstreaming, the practice of educating handicapped children in regular school classes, is one of the most prominent and controversial subjects in contemporary education. Indeed, it concerns not only school children, teachers, and administrators, but also parents—of the disabled and the "normal"—and, finally, America's law courts and legislatures.

To understand the situation fully, it is first necessary to understand just how an educational policy question has become a social, political, and legal issue. An impressive and growing body of evidence indicates that America's schools have long tended to neglect or exclude children who have difficulty learning in the regular classroom. One attempt to solve this problem was to establish a separate system of special education that could provide handicapped children with the learning opportunities they were not getting in regular classes. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons—some of them unavoidable—special education has not, at least thus far, fulfilled its promise.

As a result, those concerned that the handicapped should receive the free public education considered the right of every normal child began to seek redress outside the educational system. Recently, a series of court decisions and state laws has attempted to address the question of adequate educational opportunities for the handicapped. Turnbull discusses the legal rationale behind this process:

> A major development of the law in the 1970s has been the extension of the principle of egalitarianism to the developmentally disabled, particularly the mentally retarded. This principle [is] that all persons, however unequal they may be in terms of their development, should be treated equally in the sense of being granted equal opportunities.

If the education of the handicapped is a question of equality of opportunity—the very touchstone of democracy—it seems only proper that it be debated outside the educational system

and resolved by the institutions that govern society.

Mainstreaming is one widely discussed approach to educating the handicapped. Unfortunately, if understandably, the word itself is often used imprecisely. For example, the following terms are used more or less synonymously with mainstreaming: "normalization of the handicapped," "regular class placement," even "integration." Because mainstreaming is likened to so many things, it is difficult to know precisely just what the word means.

In reflecting the diversity of the literature, a useful definition should be as flexible and inclusive as possible. For this reason we define *mainstreaming* to be a program whereby handicapped children are placed in regular classrooms for all or part of the school day, with steps taken to see that their special needs are satisfied within this arrangement.

It is also important to identify the target group, the children to be mainstreamed. In its broadest usage, mainstreaming applies to all the handicapped, whom Turnbull defines as "blind or visually disabled, deaf or hard-of-hearing, physically disabled, emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, or those who have speech impediments, learning disabilities, or multiple handicaps."

But it is the mentally retarded whose educational needs are currently receiving the most attention. This emphasis is particularly appropriate, since "mental retardation," in contrast to, for example, "blindness," is a broad, flexible, and ambiguous term that may encompass a wide range of learning problems and solutions. In this respect, retardation is typical of the diversity and complexity of educational difficulties the term "handicapped" may encompass.

Accordingly, this report will emphasize the mentally retarded, though our discussion will attempt to be as comprehensive as possible, in recognition of the fact that the very term *mainstreaming* is neither precise nor absolute. Further, the implications of mainstreaming for contemporary education can be properly understood only within the broad context of the current legal and educational status of the handicapped.

Perhaps the principal impetus toward mainstreaming has been the emergence of a legal mandate for better treatment of the handicapped. But the practical implications of this mandate for education are far from clear.

To begin with, as Turnbull comments, "There is no general agreement about the size of the target population—the number of handicapped school-aged persons in the United States—except that it is large." He cites several conflicting estimates, one of which claims the number of retarded students is three times as large as another claims. Further, the authorities themselves apparently disagree on how to identify the relevant target group. In addition, as we shall see, the whole question of labeling the retarded is itself extremely controversial.

But if the number of handicapped students of school age is uncertain, their status in education is not. Although most discussions of the merits of mainstreaming assume that if students are not placed in regular classes, they will be assigned to special education, Turnbull cites evidence suggesting that this is a misconception. For example, in 1969, the President's Committee on Mental Retardation found that 60 percent of the mentally retarded were not being educated at all. Indeed, as Turnbull glumly adds, "It is widely accepted that most handicapped children receive no educational services at all or only inappropriate services."

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that representatives of the handicapped have increasingly sought legal redress for the situation. Turnbull analyzes the most important issues in the legal debate over the education of the handicapped. He notes that the Supreme Court's landmark 1954 decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, which denied the legality of "separate but equal" educational systems for black and white students, has, two decades later, been extended:

Although *Brown v. Board of Education* established the right to an equal educational opportunity, based upon Fourteenth Amendment grounds, it was not until *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (hereinafter "PARC") and *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia* (hereinafter "Mills") that *Brown* became meaningful for the developmentally disabled.

Turnbull describes these two cases in considerable detail.

PARC was resolved by a consent decree (ruling agreed to by all parties and the court) resting on the following conclusions:

- that all the mentally retarded can benefit, to some extent, from education and training
- that the state has undertaken to provide free public education for all school age children including the retarded
- that the state may not deny any retarded child access to a free public education and training program
- that the state must place each such child in an appropriate program, with regular class placement preferred to special class placement

The decree further requires that the state locate and identify children who have been excluded from public schools and that it carefully evaluate and periodically reevaluate those children who are placed in special education programs.

Mills addresses the question of placement, stipulating that before a child can be excluded from public education, he or she must be provided with an adequate alternative education and that placement outside the regular school system must be preceded by a constitutionally adequate prior hearing.

These decisions have been extremely influential; Turnbull notes that "subsequent cases have closely followed *PARC* and *Mills* in the arguments made, in both the form of the decision and the relief granted." As Keogh and others note, the effect of these rulings has been a basic change in special education practices.

There are, however, limitations to what the courts can accomplish. As Turnbull observes, "court-initiated change is

likely to be more incremental, marginal, hortatory and reactionary than legal and educational reformers might hope." In addition, even this judicial involvement has not been comprehensive, since "no court has made a careful legal analysis of the equal-protection issues as applied to the developmentally disabled pupil." State laws, some enacted in response to litigation, also seem to be fostering change, though implementation of such mandated change often tends to be slow and irregular.

SPECIAL EDUCATION VERSUS MAINSTREAMING

As Turnbull observes, the worst educational problem for the handicapped is still the inadequacy or nonexistence of efforts to meet their special needs. Nevertheless, most contemporary discussions of the education of the handicapped seem to focus primarily on the debate over the relative merits of special education and mainstreaming. There is now considerable resistance to the idea that special education or any program based on treating handicapped students as *different* can be either effective or desirable. This seems particularly ironic, since the original impetus for special education was the desire to provide an alternative—specialized educational services—for those students whose needs were unique and could not be met in the regular classroom.

The Problem of Labels

Both the record of special education and its underlying rationale have increasingly come under hostile scrutiny. One of the chief objections has been to the idea of labeling children—as "retarded," for example. On the face of it, such a label can serve only a limited purpose; it implies that there is something "wrong" with a child in completely general terms, but does little to suggest what the child's needs are or how they can best be met. It further implies that all labeled children—for example, all the retarded—are essentially alike, with common problems calling for a single method of treatment. However, as Iano notes, children who have in common a low intelligence quotient—the most popular method of measuring retardation—do not display common learning characteristics that distinguish them from other children. Nor are children with low IQs so similar to each other and different from others that they require unique educational goals at the elementary level.

Labeling can have more directly adverse effects on students as well. For example, a label implying that a child is deficient may influence the way that child is identified by himself and others. In this way, the label becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, conditioning teacher expectations for the child and even distorting the child's own self-concept.

The stigmatizing effect of the label of retardation is doubly ironic: As Burton Blatt notes in an interview reported by Jordan, the term *retarded* is not scientific and is little more than a metaphor, since, by refining the definition of the term, it is possible to "cure" far more people than by treatment.

The attack on labeling has also come from another direction. Perhaps because labels are themselves unscientific, they may be erroneously applied. For example, Bradfield and others emphasize the vagueness of labels, pointing out that "in many cases the special child becomes difficult to find in this modified environment and the labels that have been pinned on him tend to fade." Meyers states the case even more emphatically, claiming that most retarded persons are labeled as such only by the schools. Such labeling is often far from definitive since, as he notes,

> well over half of the school's EMRs [educable mentally retarded] are, however, able-bodied children who have not been identified as different before school attendance, and who, upon leaving school, are not differentiated from the co-workers of equivalent status and residence.

As a result, he sarcastically comments, "the milder EMRs are 'chronic' only in the school years, and 'recover' upon leaving school."

Several writers point out that the very existence of a record of a classification as "retarded" may be a permanent stigma on the child. In addition, the least severe degree of mental retardation, "educable," is also by far the most prevalent, so the potential number of socially functional persons labeled by the schools as "retarded" is quite large.

Methods of Classification

If the theoretical and practical utility of labels is dubious,

the methods actually used in classification decisions are even more open to criticism. To begin with, many children ultimately classed as "retarded" are referred by classroom teachers for testing. As Meyers notes, teachers may have an understandable tendency to seek special placement for disruptive children, who cause the most problems in classrooms, rather than for retarded children, who may be far easier to manage than to teach.

In addition, if a child can be tested and labeled, there is always the possibility of mislabeling. The chief measure of retardation is often the IQ score. Yet the cultural, social, racial, and even sexual biases of IQ tests have been sufficiently well documented to make their value in determining the course of a child's entire educational career questionable.

Misclassifications may also occur for other reasons. Novotny suggests these reasons may include a combination of a reading problem and a low IQ, low socioeconomic status and poor school behavior, and problems in the interaction of the student with teachers, curricula, and materials. Keogh and her colleagues suggest that tests may be inappropriately selected or incompetently administered, adding that there is generally a lack of parental involvement in screening and placement decisions.

These authors further comment that "the net effect of traditional selection and placement practices was to work against pupils from ethnic minority and disadvantaged economic backgrounds." Both Kaufman and others and Sussman also allude to the fact that children from minority groups tend to be overrepresented in special classes, a fact that has, according to Kaufman and others, aroused considerable minority group resentment against special education itself. Perhaps the case against labeling is best summarized by Turnbull:

> School classification by testing has been criticized because classifications are too rigid, they serve almost no educational purpose, they result in misclassifications, they are racially discriminatory in motive or effect or both, they have an adverse effect on school success, they stigmatize, and they result in self-fulfilling and self-limited prophesies.

There seem also to be serious questions about the value of special education itself. Gjessing notes that some research suggests that children with learning difficulties are unlikely to have more success in special than regular classes. Sussman, too, questions the efficacy of special education in improving the academic performance of the handicapped, noting that alternatives to special placement are often equally effective and even that "in some instances no special treatment has served equally well."

According to the critics, special education is of no more value behaviorally than educationally. Orlando and Lynch, who point out that there is little special in the methods or materials used in special education, add that "one is hard pressed to see the special class as a training ground for children who must live in the mainstream of society on the completion of their formal education." In addition, Taylor, who found no evidence of significant performance differences between students in regular and special classes, did conclude that "special classes may lead, in the long run, to maladaptive behavior."

Gampel and others describe an effort to determine whether a child's classroom behavior was determined primarily by IQ or placement history:

> The results of this investigation confirm those obtained previously which indicated that EMR children in segregated classes in a middle-class suburban school system exhibit higher incidences of hostile, aggressive behaviors than do integrated EMR children. An additional finding in the present study was that the latter group did not differ significantly from either low IQ nonEMR or intellectually average children on any of the three factors.

Gampel offers several possible explanations for these findings. It may be that segregated EMRs are expected to act retarded (or, in the parlance of the children, "dumb") whereas integrated children are not, and those placed in each setting simply act to conform to those expectations. Another possibility is

that, in integrated settings, retarded children have models for normal behavior among their classmates and peer reinforcement for acting appropriately, while students in special settings have neither. The third possible explanation, that integrated children are afraid to misbehave in new class settings especially for fear of being returned to special classes *that evidence shows they dislike*, is, in some ways, the most telling argument of all.

Another line of reasoning that is used, perhaps unfairly, to criticize special education is to emphasize the way its functions have been abused. Turnbull comments that "special education serves valued escape-hatch purposes, permitting schools to classify as handicapped the children considered undesirable—the racial minorities, the disruptive, and the different." This is particularly serious, since "once a child is placed in a special education program, there is little incentive to return him to a normal program."

The Special Education Debate: Pro

Several of these criticisms actually focus on the potential for misuse, not the intrinsic value, of special education. Indeed, it seems only fair to point out that insofar as the educational system has never had a genuine commitment to meeting the special needs of the handicapped, it could never have had any real commitment to the successful implementation of the concept of special education. Since special education has never really been given a chance to succeed, it can hardly be said to have "failed." It may be true that special class placement, by removing handicapped children from visible presence in the mainstream of education, does make it easier to neglect such children, but this, too, is an abuse, not a proper application of the principle of special education.

Several writers defend special education on this basis, citing its failure as an argument for correcting abuses rather than dismantling the entire system. Ohrtman specifically claims that the reason special classes "too often do a poor job is because of their abuse and misuse, not because of any weakness of the concept that led to their establishment." He adds that

the failure of special education can also partially be explained as the result of excessive demands being placed on an emerging professional specialty. Cruickshank, too, points to the ways special education has been abused, particularly singling out for blame "administrators who force misplacement of children for their own convenience." In this view, special education can become a dumping ground, a device for removing problems from the regular classroom and freeing regular education from responsibility for attempting to find solutions for them.

It is also important to recognize that special education originated because regular classes could not meet the needs of some students. Mainstreaming, which returns such students to the scenes of their original failures, surely requires, at best, careful implementation. As Cruickshank notes, children who are retarded are, by the very definition of the term, less able to learn than normal children. In addition, long-standing evidence shows that they progress more slowly than their normal peers, even with good teaching.

Retarded children are considered likely to have lower rates of achievement; Cruickshank ponders the meaning of this possibility for "the development of positive self-concept for the retarded child in a competitive class." Gjessing, too, alludes to the constant, possibly harmful pressure that may be placed on exceptional children in regular classrooms.

There are other arguments advanced in support of special education. In Cruickshank's view, it is a basic fact that learning-disabled students have special needs that simply cannot be met by regular classroom teachers as they are now trained. In addition, careful attention should be paid to the attitudes of normal students toward their retarded classmates; the degree of tolerance children are apt to have for those different from themselves is a factor that ought to be considered in placing retarded children. Ohrtman even defends the practice of thoughtful, responsible labeling, noting that "there are etiological considerations in dealing with the handicapped," that labels can be useful, and that "to deny differences will not negate them when they really exist."

There is other, more specific evidence of the value of special education. Trippi, for example, comments that

> some research has shown that mentally retarded children in the regular grades typically are less well-adjusted, have fewer friends, fewer after-school jobs, and fewer realistic goals than mentally retarded children who have been placed in special classes.

These findings can be explained best by the assumption that "retarded children who have been in special classes have experienced situations in which they have gained a sense of accomplishment and greater feelings of self-confidence and social adequacy."

Schurr and others report on a study that found that student self-concept tended to increase with special class placement. Surprisingly, though, increased academic achievement did not accompany this improvement in self-concept. In searching for an explanation of this finding, the authors speculate that as self-concept improves "a corresponding increase in achievement need not take place if academic learning opportunities are at a low level, if the student does not engage in practice activities, or if he defines learning of academic material as an inappropriate behavior."

The Verdict

Just as there are a variety of studies demonstrating the value of special education, so, too, there are, in about equal numbers, those proving that mainstreaming has enormous social and educational advantages. Novotny, however, concludes that "According to all the results noted, then, mainstreaming has yet to prove its inherent worth." Perhaps the net results of all studies, the sum total of current knowledge concerning the relative merits of special education and mainstreaming, is best summarized by Novotny's wry observation:

> Several educational setting comparative studies have been conducted. Their findings reveal both integration and segregation are superior and of equal value.

> The controversy between regular and special classes has nearly obscured the fact that there are a wide variety of ways that integration can be accomplished. Rather than a single, simple model, there are major program differences in such areas as who is integrated, how long they are in the regular classroom, what educational system is involved, what teaching strategies are used, and what support systems are employed.
>
> *Guerin and Szatlocky*

Despite differences in the way mainstreaming can be achieved, there are certain program attributes that seem to be essential to any effective effort to mainstream. Perhaps the key to successful mainstreaming is providing individualized instruction to meet the unique, personal needs of each child. Reger implies that a first step in successful individualization is to reject labeling children according to "gross diagnostic categories" and, instead, to concentrate on evaluating each child's strengths and weaknesses in regard to specific educational outcomes. In addition, Martin suggests that successful individualized instruction requires careful planning and continuous evaluation of each child's progress toward specific objectives, including emotional and social progress.

Focus on the Individual

Mainstreaming and individualized instruction pose important organizational questions for schools. As Birch points out, "Mainstreaming means shifting from the class to the individual as the basic unit around which special education is planned, organized, and conducted." As a result, it will be necessary to reassess the effectiveness of various types of organizational arrangements in meeting individual needs. Iano, for example, argues against the conventional age grade system, calling for more flexible groupings with nongraded organization. All children, not just the retarded, would benefit from a reduced tendency to evaluate students against arbitrary

normative standards.

Iano also asserts that new educational approaches should be developed in recognition of the fact that the quality of a specific school environment may be far more educationally relevant to the child than any specific labels may be. He concludes, "If flexible procedures for placement, grouping, and programming of children were used in both general and special education, they would enhance each other and function best in a coordinated manner." Budoff likewise emphasizes the need to "find ways of determining the extent to which various types of school structures can be stretched to accommodate the great diversity of educational needs of its students." Like Iano, Budoff concludes that nongraded open schools give teachers more ability to arrange individualized teaching programs.

Budoff also raises another organizational question by suggesting that there may be some children who fall outside the range of those whose needs can best be met in the regular classroom. The question of how to determine whether or not a child can be successfully mainstreamed is a puzzling one. Turnbull makes the following suggestion:

> A decision on whether to mainstream should depend in part on the child's age and disability; in part on what other programs are available in the school system or outside it; in part on the availability of skilled resources—teachers and resource teachers—in the school program and outside it.

In addition, Reynolds insists that "a placement or instructional decision must be made on the evidence of advantage for the individual and not on the difficulties associated with having the individual in the mainstream or another particular setting." Further, it is advisable to "displace a child to special settings only when it is necessary to control variables in his behalf in such a way that it is impossible in the more natural environment of his community."

The problem of whom to mainstream is closely related to several other questions. Novotny, for example, suggests five questions that should be answered before a school attempts to implement a mainstreaming program:

- How many students should be mainstreamed into a given school?
- What is the most desirable ratio of regular to exceptional students?
- Where should the locus of control—the ultimate responsibility for a child's or a program's success or failure—be located?
- Should integration be full- or part-time?
- What are the best forms of individualization?

Cruickshank ponders the question of optimal class size and suggests that smaller classes may be desirable for mainstreaming. He also argues that the range of abilities in a class should be narrow enough so that the retarded child can have "a genuine success experience."

A Spectrum of Services

Even as the debate between special education and mainstreaming continues, it is becoming increasingly clear that, as Reynolds points out, the two-box theory of special education, in which children are placed *either* in special *or* regular classes, is both superficial and obsolete. Instead, discussion of the education of the handicapped should focus on ways to provide a variety of services. Reynolds notes that, by now, mainstreaming is "the single most conspicuous trend in the field of special education." But he describes a complete system of education for the handicapped as follows:

> a broad continuum or cascade of instructional and administrative arrangements that ranges from regular class placements; to regular placements with consultation, or resource teacher or itinerant teacher help; to part-time special classes, full-time special classes, local day schools, regional centers, residential schools, and hospitals.

The most pertinent educational question then becomes not which type of education is "better," but rather where the specific needs of each individual child can best be served.

Guerin and Szatlocky list four different models for achieving integration:

- Programmed partial integration, where all retarded students are based in special classes and programmed into regular classes for specific blocks of time.
- Total integration, where all retarded students are in regular classes all day, with three to six retarded students in each of three classes; special education funds can be used to pay for reduced class size and increased supplementary aid.
- Integration using a learning resource center, with all retarded students assigned to regular classes; special teachers in learning resource centers would see retarded pupils one or two hours a day alone or in small groups.
- An arrangement similar to the resource center, but with special teachers who are itinerant and meet children in learning disability groups.

In discussing the four types of programs, the authors note that, "while programmed partial integration was the method most frequently employed, it offered the retarded student the least amount of integration and regular and special teacher support." They point out that teachers seem to have the most normal expectations for fully integrated students, whom they usually regard as class members rather than visitors.

The Resource Room

It is clear, then, that "mainstreaming" covers a wide range of programs. One promising approach to meeting the unique needs of the special child within the regular classroom is a supplementary resource program. Any such program is based on the fact that the original impetus for special education was the inability of the handicapped to get along, without help, in regular classes. Thus the aim of a resource program is to attempt to offer the services of special education to handicapped children on a part-time basis, allowing them to spend the balance of their time in regular classrooms. This approach, at least in theory, can have several advantages, including those Hammill lists:

- The child can be given special help, yet remains integrated.
- The child can be given a total remedial program, planned by the resource teacher but implemented in conjunction with the

regular teacher.

- Resource programs are less expensive than special education.
- Resource programs have a greater multiplier effect than do special education programs.
- The resource room teacher can be part of the school, not an outsider.
- Children can avoid some of the stigma of labels and segregation.
- Scheduling can be flexible, with the resource room used only as needed.
- The time lapse between referral and placement can be eliminated.
- Special settings can be devoted to the truly handicapped.

Resource room programs can, as Jenkins and Mayhall note, vary in several ways. Some, for example, offer the child direct service, with special teaching done outside the regular classroom; others are indirect, with the resource teacher serving as a consultant to the regular teacher. In addition, programs may be oriented toward the teaching of specific skills or more general types of abilities. The orientation of a program may be diagnostic or prescriptive, and the resource teacher may be resident or itinerant.

Flexible resource programs can offer a variety of services. Sabatino suggests that a program offer evaluation and planning for each child, based on consultation among teachers, coordinators, and psychologists. The resource room teacher may teach and evaluate children, offer help to teachers, observe classrooms, confer with teachers and parents, and act to facilitate full-time integration. In fact, when the resource teacher is a part of a school's staff, the services of such a teacher may also be available to students who need help but would not ordinarily be considered eligible for the services of special education.

Despite this wave of enthusiasm, several writers express doubts about the universal utility of the resource concept. Shaw and Shaw, for example, suggest that most resource room programs are deficient in at least two ways: they remove the child from the regular class for part of the day, and they aim to provide direct services to the child. Both

practices encourage abrogation of teacher responsibility, since it is "someone else"—the resource teacher—who is actually providing the special services. Padover further notes that such programs tend to ease institutional guilt, by making failure the fault of the child rather than the school.

Padover describes a program that confronts these problems, using a Diagnostic Prescriptive Teacher (DPT), "a school based specialist in educational diagnosis and planning for those children perceived as presenting problems in learning and/or behavior." The job of such a teacher is to provide indirect service by offering regular teachers specific information about what motivates a child and what sort of educational environment is best suited for that child. "The diagnostic teacher, by working with and observing both the child and the regular classroom teacher, develops successful educational strategies for each referred child and the teacher." In this way, the special skill and expertise of the DPT is utilized without directly infringing on the instructional prerogatives of the regular teacher.

Two key questions to ask about any resource program are where it assigns ultimate instructional responsibility and how much expertise it requires of the regular class teacher. The disadvantages of direct service programs, requiring no special teacher expertise, have been noted earlier. Where responsibility is shared and the resource teacher functions primarily as a consultant (as with the DPT), the regular teacher may not need special diagnostic skills, but must have the ability to implement individualized programs. With this, as with any arrangement, it is crucial that instructional responsibility be clearly delineated.

Yet another approach is to make serving the handicapped entirely the job of the regular class teacher. This method will certainly require additional teacher training, but its advantages can be considerable. Well-trained teachers can provide more effective instruction to both handicapped and normal students.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

One important, easily neglected aspect of training teachers for mainstreaming is the need to change not only levels of skill and expertise, but also attitudes. Martin mentions the need to understand the real but irrational reasons teachers may have for resisting mainstreaming. He points out that there is a need for massive efforts to work with regular teachers, not only to "instruct them in the pedagogy of special education, but to share in their feelings, to understand their fears, to provide them with assistance and materials, and, in short, to assure their success." He further points out that, until now, there has not been enough teacher training to keep pace with the mainstreaming effort and that, when there is such training, it is likely to "be rationalistic and skill-oriented and fail to respond to the feeling and attitude issues."

Birch lists several potential mainstreaming problems that may be of special concern to teachers, including how mainstreamed students will behave in the classroom and interact with regular students, how to organize instruction, and how to cope with the emotional and physical problems of the handicapped. In addition, teachers may be concerned about the adequacy of their preparation, the lack of support services, teacher liability, parental hostility, and even grading. More generally, teachers may see mainstreaming itself as a threat, a perception that will certainly not be altered by the pressures of parental or administrative demands.

More specific skills training is also important in preparing teachers to educate the handicapped. The goal of such training should be to give teachers the knowledge and skills they need to implement individualized instructional programs for all their students. Since changes need to be made immediately, most teacher training will have to be inservice, so that teachers who are already working can be trained.

Glass and Meckler describe one inservice training program in some detail. It consisted of an intensive summer workshop designed to equip teachers with the diagnostic, remedial, and behavior management skills relevant to mainstreaming. These skills included increased abilities to instruct the mildly handicapped in the regular classroom, to modify use of teacher authority, to encourage greater student responsibility in school matters (such as helping other students), and to facilitate increased student-teacher dialogue. This program was apparently successful in giving teachers increased abilities and greater self-confidence. The authors reached at least two primary conclusions from the program:

- Specific skills relative to the instruction of mildly handicapped children can be isolated and taught to elementary teachers in a relatively short period of time.
- Functional preparation with its emphasis on developing and practicing specific skills in an action oriented setting may be a more productive approach to educating elementary teachers in special education techniques than traditional university courses, which tend to remain at an abstract level.

Superficially, it might appear that the administrator, who is not directly involved in instruction, is scarcely affected by mainstreaming. In fact, though, this is far from the truth; as Budoff comments, "integration, by whatever set of options, is an administrative or organizational solution." In mainstreaming, regular schools accept a responsibility for the handicapped that is primarily administrative; they must provide services to handicapped students without resorting to the administrative expedient of removing them to special settings. In addition, it is absolutely crucial to the success of mainstreaming efforts that administrators, particularly principals, provide support and leadership. Klinger, for example, points out that "without the total, active support of school administrators (e.g., principals and supervisors), the progress made by cooperating classroom teachers was painfully slow and narrow in scope." Birch takes a similar view:

> Principals were viewed as the chief field representatives of the mainstreaming concept. Without principals in that role on a

continuing basis, mainstreaming could be expected to have a difficult time.

These writers are by no means unique in emphasizing the crucial role of administrators in the mainstreaming effort.

There are other, more general ways administrators can help with mainstreaming. Kraft emphasizes the need for administrators to set the proper tone for mainstreaming by helping teachers understand "that the major challenge of education is coping with children, not getting subject matter through their heads." And Brown lists several questions the administrator should ponder in planning a mainstreaming effort:

- How does a program relate to possible legal problems regarding the education of exceptional children?
- Will current state funding procedures provide support?
- Is the program likely to elicit community support?
- Can it be staffed adequately?
- Does the program facilitate faculty growth?
- Can it be implemented successfully in a specific situation?

Questions of funding are particularly important in mainstreaming. As Turnbull notes, it is more expensive to educate a handicapped than a normal child, though this has been held to be an inadequate reason for denying the handicapped appropriate educational services. In some cases, special education has been implemented in ways that provide a financial incentive for its perpetuation and extension. As Kraft notes, "more and more states are subsidizing special education to the point where it more than pays for itself."

Funding can also influence how children are labelled; Kaufman and others note that there are two ways to allocate money for mainstreaming—according to the total number of students in a system or the number of handicapped students. Needless to say, this provides a financial incentive for labeling students as "handicapped." A number of writers seem to agree, though, that mainstreaming, at least in certain forms, is less expensive than special education.

CONCLUSION

In a sense, the controversy that surrounds mainstreaming is both puzzling and unproductive. Despite all the attention paid to the debate over the comparative merits of special education and mainstreaming, the issue is actually just one aspect of the larger problem of how to educate the handicapped. The fact that there is, as yet, no clear answer to the question—no definitive decision as to which approach is "better"—suggests that each has its uses, that a really effective educational system would combine the best attributes of both.

It is important to recognize, finally, that mainstreaming is just another label and, as such, may obscure more than it reveals. Just as the mere use of a simplistic label like "retarded" may not have much practical value, neither will careless endorsements of "mainstreaming" if they imply the value of one specific approach to educating the handicapped in preference to all others.

It is not enough simply to say a child is "retarded"; the label is useful only if it facilitates the discovery of the specific needs of the child and of ways to meet them. Similarly, it is insufficient simply to assert that "handicapped children should be educated in regular classrooms." What is needed is a commitment by educators to organize an educational system sufficiently broad and flexible that it can provide all its children with the educational services most appropriate to their needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items listed in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

Copies of most ERIC reports, but not journal articles, can be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. If a report is available from EDRS, its order number and prices are given. When ordering, please specify the "ED" number. Unless otherwise noted, reports are available in both microfiche (MF) and paper copy (HC). Please include check or money order payable to EDRS.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Rates are as follows.
Microfiche: $0.21 for up to 60 fiche and $0.09 for each additional 60.
Paper copy: $0.21 for first 60 pages and $0.09 for each additional 60.

Address requests to EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Belkin, Larry. "Miracles for the Retarded." *AV Guide: The Learning Media Magazine*, 51, 9 (September 1972), pp. 8-10, 18-19. EJ 066 672.

Birch, Jack W. *Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes.* 1974. 117 pages. ED 090 724 MF $0.76 HC $5.70. (Also available from Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. Stock No. 82, $3.00, orders under $25.00 prepaid.)

Bradfield, Robert H., and others. "The Special Child in the Regular Classroom." *Exceptional Children*, 39, 5 (February 1973), pp. 384-390. EJ 071 605.

Brown, Jean Woodley. *A Humanistic Approach to Special Education. Resource Monograph No. 8.* Gainesville: P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, University of Florida, 1973. 92 pages. ED 102 742 MF $0.76 HC $4.43.

Budoff, Milton. "Providing Special Education without Special Classes." *Journal of School Psychology*, 10, 2 (1972), pp. 199-205. EJ 064 496.

Cruickshank, W. M. "The False Hope of Integration." *Slow Learning Child*, 21, 2 (July 1974), pp. 67-83. EJ 107 357.

Gampel, Dorothy H., and others. "Comparison of Classroom Behavior of Special-Class EMR, Integrated EMR, Low IQ, and Nonretarded

Children." *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 79, 1 (July 1974), pp. 16-21. EJ 107 390.

Gjessing, Hans-Jorgen. "Integration of the Handicapped: What Demands Will Be Made?" *Slow Learning Child*, 19, 1 (March 1972), pp. 28-39. EJ 061 999.

Glass, Raymond M., and Meckler, Roy S. "Preparing Elementary Teachers to Instruct Mildly Handicapped Children in Regular Classrooms: A Summer Workshop." *Exceptional Children*, 39, 2 (October 1972), pp. 152-156. EJ 064 865.

Guerin, Gilbert R., and Szatlocky, Kathleen. "Integration Programs for the Mildly Retarded." *Exceptional Children*, 41, 3 (November 1974), pp. 173-179. EJ 112 504.

Hammill, Donald. "The Resource-Room Model in Special Education." *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 4 (Winter 1972), pp. 349-354. EJ 079 671.

Iano, Richard P. "Shall We Disband Special Classes?" *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 2 (Summer 1972), pp. 167-177. EJ 073 146.

Jenkins, Joseph R., and Mayhall, William F. "Describing Resource Teacher Programs." *Exceptional Children*, 40, 1 (September 1973), pp. 35-36. EJ 084 554.

Jordan, June B. "On the Educability of Intelligence and Related Issues—A Conversation with Burton Blatt." *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 8, 4 (December 1973), pp. 219-229. EJ 096 195.

Kaufman, Martin J., and others. *Project PRIME. Interim Report Year One 1971-1972 (Purpose and Procedures)*. n.p.: 1973. 507 pages. ED 106 307 MF $0.92 HC not available from EDRS.

Keogh, Barbara K., and others. *A Review of Transition Programs in California Public Schools. Technical Report SERP 1974-A2*. Los Angeles: California State University; and Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1974. 95 pages. ED 102 794 MF $0.76 HC $4.43.

Klinger, Ronald L. "A Shift of Emphasis in Texas Education." *Journal of School Psychology*, 10, 2 (1972), pp. 152-156. EJ 064 495.

Kraft, Arthur. "Down with (Most) Special Education Classes." *Academic Therapy*, 8, 2 (Winter 1972-73), pp. 207-216. EJ 069 868.

Mann, Philip H., and Brizner, Jeffrey L. "Labeling and Minority Groups: An Issue." In *Mainstream Special Education: Issues and Perspectives in Urban Centers*, (Proceedings of the University of Miami Conference on Special Education in Great Cities), edited by Philip H. Mann, pp. 37-43. Coral Gables, Florida: University of

Miami, 1974. 172 pages. ED 093 141 MF $0.76 HC $8.24. (Also available from Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. $3.50, quantity discounts.)

Martin, Edwin W. "Some Thoughts on Mainstreaming." *Exceptional Children*, 41, 3 (November 1974), pp. 150-153. EJ 112 501.

Meyers, C. Edward. "The School Psychologist and Mild Retardation—Report of an Ad Hoc Committee." *Mental Retardation*, 11, 1 (February 1973), pp. 15-20. EJ 074 654.

Novotny, Patricia Ann. *Mainstreaming the EMR Is neither a Panacea nor a Simple Solution: A Research Study*. n.p.: 1974. 22 pages. ED 101 52? MF $0.76 HC $1.58.

Ohrtman, William F. "One More Instant Solution Coming Up." *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 4 (Winter 1972), pp. 377-381. EJ 079 675.

Orlando, Charles, and Lynch, Jerry. "Learning Disabilities or Educational Casualties? Where Do We Go from Here?" *Elementary School Journal*, 74, 8 (May 1974), pp. 461-467. EJ 101 350.

Padover, Ann. "Some Words Are Not Healthy for Children and Other Living Things." *Academic Therapy*, 8, 4 (Summer 1973), pp. 437-445. EJ 099 480.

Reger, Roger. "What Is a Resource Room Program?" *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 6, 10 (December 1973), pp. 609-613. EJ 092 794.

Reynolds, Maynard C. "Criteria in the Public Education of the Severely Handicapped." Speech presented at Saskatchewan Federation, Council for Exceptional Children, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, November 1973. 35 pages. ED 093 123 MF $0.76 HC $1.95.

Sabatino, David A. "Resource Rooms: The Renaissance in Special Education." *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 4 (Winter 1972), pp. 335-347. EJ 079 670.

Schurr, K. Terry, and others. "Trends in Self-Concept of Ability over Two Years of Special-Class Placement." *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 2 (Summer 1972), pp. 161-166. EJ 073 145.

Shaw, Stan F., and Shaw, Wilma K. "The In-Service Experience Plan, or Changing the Bath without Losing the Baby." *Journal of Special Education*, 6, 2 (Summer 1972), pp. 121-126. EJ 073 141.

Shotel, Jay R., and others. "Teacher Attitudes Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children." *Exceptional Children*, 38, 9 (May 1972), pp. 677-683. EJ 084 517.

Sussman, Susan. *The Organization of Education for Learning Handicapped Pupils: A Review and Recommendations*. Toronto: York

Borough Board of Education, 1974. 45 pages. ED 091 912 MF $0.76 HC $1.95.

Taylor, George R. "Special Education at the Crossroad: Class Placement for the EMR." *Mental Retardation*, 11, 2 (April 1973), pp. 30-33. EJ 081 289.

Trippi, Joseph A. "Special-Class Placement and Suggestibility of Mentally Retarded Children." *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 78, 2 (September 1973), pp. 220-222. EJ 092 817.

Turnbull, H. Rutherford III. *Legal Aspects of Educating the Developmentally Disabled. NOLPE Second Monograph Series on Legal Aspects of School Administration, No. 6. ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, No. 31.* Eugene; and Topeka, Kansas: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon; and National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1975. 59 pages. ED 111 049 MF $0.76 HC $3.32. (Also available from National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 825 Western Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66606. $4.95.)